

*Journal
of the
Child Welfare League
of America
Inc.*

child welfare

November 1955

Protective Casework Revitalized

Separation and Identity

Social Dynamics of a Day Care
Association

CHILD WELFARE JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

CHILD WELFARE is a forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CONTENTS

	Page
Protective Casework: Revitalized.	1
By Bertram M. Beck	
The Problem of Separation and the Feeling of Identity	8
By Edith Buxbaum, Ph.D.	
Social Dynamics of a Day Care Association.	16
By Margaret C. McCulloch	
Editorial Comment	
"Children Deprived of Adoption"	21
News from the Field.	22
Reader's Forum.	23
Book Notes	24
Classified Ad Service	26

Editorial and general office: 345 East 46th Street, N. Y. 17, N. Y. Published monthly except August and September by the Child Welfare League of America, Inc. Annual Subscription, \$3.00; Single Copies, 35 cents.

VOL. XXXIV

No. 9

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Officers

MARSHALL FIELD, *President*, New York
 MRS. HERBERT F. FISHER, *Vice-Pres.*, Hartford, Conn.
 MRS. JOE HEAL GARDNER, *Vice-Pres.*, Conde, Va.
 MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER, *Vice-Pres.*, New York
 MRS. GEORGE L. WEST, *Vice-Pres.*, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 MRS. RAY W. WITFOLGARY, *Vice-Pres.*, San Angelo, Texas
 MRS. LOS WILBY, *Secretary*, Chicago, Ill.
 THOMAS M. PETERS, *Treasurer*, New York
 JOSEPH H. REID, *Executive Dir.*
 HELEN R. HAGAN, *Asst. Exec. Dir.*

Board of Directors

DR. LEONA BAUMGARTNER, New York, N. Y.
 FRANK S. BAYLEY, JR., Seattle, Wash.
 MRS. RICHARD J. BURNHARD, New York, N. Y.
 JUDGE JANE M. BOLIN, New York, N. Y.
 JAMES BROWN, IV, Chicago, Ill.
 MRS. ROBERT A. BROWN, Des Moines, Iowa
 MRS. SARA R. CALDWELL, Jackson, Miss.
 MRS. CHARLIE A. CHICHESTER, Piedmont, Cal.
 DR. ALFRED DAVIS, Chicago, Ill.
 MRS. IRVING EDISON, St. Louis, Mo.
 JUDGE GEORGE EDWARDS, Detroit, Mich.
 DR. MARTHA M. ELLIOT, Washington, D. C.
 ALAN S. GLISMER, Cleveland, Ohio
 CLYDE GELTZ, Los Angeles, Cal.
 AUSTIN T. GRAVES, Darien, Conn.
 JOSEPH E. HYAS, Atlanta, Ga.
 SHIRLEY M. HARRISON, New York, N. Y.
 MRS. KATH B. HYAS, Columbia, S. C.
 LESLIE E. JACOBS, Dallas, Texas
 JUDGE HARRY W. LINDMAN, Newark, N. J.
 LEONARD W. MAYOR, New York, N. Y.
 ROBERT M. MELLOR, Boston, Mass.
 GEORGE M. NAYLOR, Boston, Mass.
 JACK N. PROTZER, Chicago, Ill.
 DR. JULIUS B. RICHMOND, Syracuse, N. Y.
 JULIUS F. ROTHMAN, New York, N. Y.
 WILLIAM D. SCHIMMEL, Cleveland, Ohio
 MRS. J. EAZER SMITH, Memphis, Tenn.
 DR. FILLMAN M. SONG, Northfield, Minn.
 REV. JOSEPH P. SPRINGER, Milwaukee, Wis.
 JOHN G. TIERMAN, Washington, D. C.
 MRS. JEAN F. TRIPPE, New York, N. Y.
 C. ROLLIN ZANE, Hartford, Conn.

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

E. MARGUERITE GANE, *Chairman*
Executive Director, Children's Aid and S.P.C.A., Buffalo, N. Y.

Policy Committee

MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE
 MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER
 MR. C. ROLLIN ZANE

Advisory Committee

VIRGINIA BECKER
Executive Director, National Publicity Council, New York, N. Y.
 GORDON BERG
Community Chests and Councils, New York, N. Y.
 MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE
Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
 THELMA K. FLOWER
Executive Director
Family Services Society, Akron, Ohio
 DOROTHY HUTCHINSON
Professor of Social Work
New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.
 ADELMAIDE KAISER
Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.
 FRIDA M. KUHLMANN
Executive Secretary
First Family Day Care Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
 LUCILE LEWIS
Day Care Consultant
State Department of Welfare, Nashville, Tenn.
 ROBERT E. OTT
Director, Division of Child Guardianship, State Department of Welfare, Boston, Mass.
 VERNIE WELD
Assistant Executive Director
Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.
 RUTH WEISBERGER
Assistant Director
Sheltering Arms Children's Service, New York, N. Y.

PROTE

Bertra
 Assistant E
 National A

ANYONE
 profession
 interest
 "the har
 touch wi
 of a para
 casework
 conferen
 new serv
 Louis, O
 San Fra
 these tw
 the inter
 thing? V
 has bee
 "aggress
 practiti
 discussi
 tective c
 of auspi
 sophisti
 some p
 work an

* From
 Section,
 Francisco
 issue Mr
 the legal
 casework
 "Ruth
 New Yo
 Protectiv
 Needs,"
 Jean
 the Cris
 Lione
 tive Cas
 work, Fe
 Alice
 Help,"

CHIL

PROTECTIVE CASEWORK: REVITALIZED*

Bertram M. Beck

Assistant Executive Director
National Association of Social Workers

In this paper the author points out the concepts, either new or revitalized, that impinge upon both protective and assertive casework. He brings to our attention the marked similarity in techniques and yet the distinct difference in function of the practitioner of assertive casework and the practitioner of protective casework.

ANYONE WHO READS or even peruses the professional journals is aware of the growing interest in casework techniques to reach "the hard to reach."¹ Those in fairly close touch with the child welfare field are aware of a parallel renewal of interest in protective casework service manifested by surveys and conferences, or the actual development of new services in such cities as Louisville, St. Louis, Oklahoma City, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Wilmington. Obviously these two lines of interest are related but is the interest essentially in one and the same thing? While the social work field as a whole has been receptive to the development of "aggressive" or "assertive" casework, some practitioners have held that the subject of discussion is nothing more or less than protective casework as practiced under a variety of auspices for many years. Some of the less sophisticated practitioners have seized upon some particular element in aggressive casework and seen it as the whole. Thus in a re-

cent article on casework treatment in a police setting² one finds the statement made that field workers of the New York Juvenile Aid Bureau make every effort "to see the client at home, the community center, school or elsewhere" and that this approach "has become known as 'aggressive casework.'"

Protective, Aggressive Casework Confused

At least one group of practitioners has held that protective casework and aggressive casework are roughly equivalent even though each has a special connotation. According to this report of the St. Louis Planning Council both serve those "who do not seek or request help or who on brief contact with agencies appear to be unable to use casework help."³ Despite such formulations the question persists. In 1946, Henrietta L. Gordon wrote, "The indiscriminate use of the term 'protective service' to include the wide variety of casework services for children has impeded the development of specific professional skills and techniques which the distinctive characteristics of protective services make necessary."⁴ Mrs. Gordon's comment pertains in 1955. The question of whether or not protective casework and aggressive casework

* From a paper delivered at the Child Welfare League Section, National Conference of Social Work, San Francisco, California, June 2, 1955. For our next issue Mr. Beck has provided a related article discussing the legal and psychological implications of protective casework.

¹ Ruth Chaskel—"A Cooperative Project with the New York City Youth Board Affecting a Casework—Protective Approach in Response to Community Needs," *Social Casework*, March 1951.

Jeanette Regensberg—"Reaching Children Before the Crisis Comes," *Social Casework*, March 1954.

Lionel C. Lane—" 'Aggressive' Approach in Preventive Casework with Children's Problems," *Social Casework*, February 1952.

Alice Overton—"Serving Families Who 'Don't Want Help,'" *Social Casework*, July 1953.

² Jacob Chwast—"Casework Treatment in a Police Setting," *Federal Probation*, December 1954.

³ Social Planning Council of St. Louis and St. Louis County—"Report on the Availability and Administration of Case Work Services to Hard to Reach Persons: Mimeographed, 38 p., February 15, 1955.

⁴ Henrietta L. Gordon—"Protective Services for Children," *Child Welfare League of America Bulletin*, May 1946, p. 1.

are roughly equivalent requires clarification if we are to give leadership to the community in determining what services are needed and under what auspices services might best be offered.

To understand the current status of protective casework it is well to have some light on the climate in which it developed.

History of Protective Casework

The techniques of the early protective worker were not basically dissimilar to those of his contemporary colleagues. Social work was at that time generally concerned with imposing certain standards of behavior on its clientele. Pleading, threatening, and cajoling were all part of the techniques of the social worker. The major difference between the early protective caseworker and his colleague was that the protective caseworker operated with a clientele particularly destitute of public sympathy and in concert with the Courts was able to inflict a particularly devastating consequence on those who would not or could not conform.

The facts recounted cast no aspersion on our professional predecessors. They only indicate that they, like us, operated within the realm of knowledge available at a given point of time. It is much to their credit and to the credit of the profession that when new insights into human behavior were made available through psychoanalysis, those insights were quickly incorporated into the tissue of casework practice. The impact was nothing short of staggering. The knowledge that much behavior which was thought to be within conscious control was actually the result of unconscious forces of which the client was not aware, on one hand, made caseworkers eager to better their understanding of the totality of behavior causation and techniques to induce change and, on the other, placed a premium on obtaining a social work clientele able to benefit from the new techniques.

Quite naturally therefore, intake workers came to accept clients whose problems were not so deep seated as to be beyond the scope of the caseworker and whose personality

strength and cultural milieu were such that they could participate in, and benefit from, the particular kind of treatment being evolved. Such a criteria excluded many of the clients previously served by social agencies, in general, and particularly excluded the extremely disturbed and disorganized persons who had received attention from the protective agency.

Those agencies which did not merely exercise a protective function but had as their exclusive function protective care were not immune to such influences. Following World War I there was a rash of mergers between protective agencies and generalized children's agencies in order to strengthen the preventative-protective function of both agencies. Those protective agencies which maintained their identity began to emphasize preventative work and some of the most forward looking became indistinguishable from the more generalized child welfare agencies.

Despite these measures, protective casework was not held high in the esteem of social work. Nobody could deny that there were families who neglected their children and needed help which they could not or did not receive from agencies emphasizing the client's ability to change or the client's ability to participate in a particular kind of casework relationship. Nobody denied the right and responsibility of the Court to take from a parent, a child whose health and welfare was grossly endangered. Yet the embarrassment social work suffered from what came to be perceived as errors of an earlier day made it difficult to tolerate in the social work family, protective casework that seemed to be as a vestigial remnant of an earlier stage in the evolution of practice. By 1941 Alan Keith-Lucas⁵ was complaining that workers in the protective agencies were mimicking the practice of colleagues and failing to define, refine and use their unique authority and responsibility in respect to the neglectful parent. They were, in effect, of-

⁵ Alan Keith-Lucas—"The Case Worker in Protective Complaint Work: Responsibility in the Approach," *Child Welfare League of America Bulletin*, February 1941.

ing service to the neglectful family in a manner that the caseworker in a child guidance clinic might offer help to a mother coming in to ask for assistance with a problem in parent-child relations. By 1943 Dorothy Berkowitz reported that although family agencies still carried a few protective cases, such cases were generally considered to be the "dregs of the case load."⁶ Throughout this period, protective casework did of course have its staunch advocates who sedulously attempted to improve protective casework practice by incorporation of such new concepts as were useful and appropriate. Nevertheless, the fact remains that, in general, protective casework was in disrepute.

Interest Restored in Protective Casework

Part of the confusion between aggressive casework and protective casework can undoubtedly be attributed to the fact that it was the development of certain techniques described by the name "aggressive casework" that was responsible for restoring protective casework to its rightful place in the social work community. In 1946 there was established in the city of New York, a public organization known as the New York City Youth Board which received both state and local funds for the purpose of curbing delinquency. From the earliest stages of program development the New York City Youth Board relied in large measure on existing social agencies from which it purchased services. It soon became apparent that the then existing services with their emphasis on clients seeking help and ability to participate in the helping process were not of substantial benefit to delinquent-prone youngsters and their family. Such services seemed more appropriate to the anxiety-ridden neurotic than to the client with a type of character malformation dispelling anxiety by acting-out that was typical of the Youth Board clientele. Consequently in work with its contract agencies, a category which includes practically all the important agencies in New

York City, the Youth Board emphasized the development of "reaching out" techniques.

The early impetus to social work to alter practice so as to serve a wider range of clients came from a small service unit established jointly by the New York City Youth Board and the New York City Department of Welfare and known quite simply as the Casework Service for Families and Children. Even with the growing emphasis on reaching a wider range of client in the constituted agency it was found that there were still families who were being rejected as untreatable. To see what could be done with such families and to serve them exclusively this special unit was established with Miss Alice Overton as Director. Miss Overton established the function of the service, defined the casework techniques and named those techniques "aggressive casework."⁷ The extent to which the New York City Youth Board program has served as a model to such cities as Chicago and Boston and the rapidity with which such terms as "aggressive casework," "detached worker," and "reaching the unreached" have gained currency is testimony to the vitality of the Youth Board program and to the fact that it was brought into being at a time when the social work community was receptive to its message.

Influence of Ego-Psychology

Just as protective casework and aggressive casework have come to be confused because it was aggressive casework which led to the revitalized interest in protective casework, so they have come to be confused because the very forces which made the social work community receptive to Youth Board concepts also make it receptive to new interest in protective casework. Chief among these forces was the introduction of concepts from what has come to be called ego-psychology. Fritz Redl with his inimitable gift for language says that:

⁷Alice Overton—"Aggressive Casework," *Reaching the Unreached*; Offset, 151 p., New York City Youth Board, 500 Park Ave., N.Y.C., 1952.

⁶Dorothy Berkowitz—"Protective Case Work and the Family Agency," *The Family*, November 1943, p. 261.

"Since Anna Freud's classic book the respect for ego-psychology can be said to be an earmark of the psychoanalytical school, as contrasted with those watered-down psychotherapies which still indulge in the old pre-Anna-Freudian delusion of 'Therapy through total permissiveness of libidinous discharge.'"⁸

In the very year that Anna Freud's volume⁹ was published Dorothy Berkowitz perceived its relationship to the clients of the practitioner of protective casework and the practitioner of what has come to be called "aggressive casework" and wrote:

"Where formerly we were handicapped by limited psychological insight into the primitive force of instinctual drive, with the advent of the so-called ego-psychology we began to free ourselves from absorption in the aberrations of the libido and to develop instead a healthier concentration on the strength and potential capacity of the ego side of the personality. Normality, both in the individual and family life, was already understood as a relative rather than absolute standard. It now became apparent that there might be gross defects in family life with still a preponderance of positive values that could be preserved, comparable to the individual who could be helped to function fairly adequately though a part of his personality remained tied up in neuroses. There was new respect for that indefinable something of the human personality that enabled it to accomplish so much despite its handicaps, a realization that constructive forces usually strove to take ascendancy over the destructive."¹⁰

Influence of Social Science Concepts

Still another force making the social work community receptive to both protective and aggressive casework has been the deliberate effort to refine from the social sciences such concepts as are applicable and useful to social work.

A case in point which illustrates how the examination of sociological principles affects both protective and assertive casework and at the same time illustrates difficulties of relating concepts to historical development is that of the volume published by Otto Pollak

in 1952.¹¹ Through an examination of certain social science concepts, Dr. Pollak sought to bring together sociological thinking and psychological thinking as they impinged upon the child guidance practice of the Jewish Board of Guardians. The concept which appeared most useful to Dr. Pollak's purpose was that of the "Family of Orientation." According to Herschel Alt, Executive Director of the Jewish Board of Guardians: "recognition of the meaning of this idea had the effect of extending diagnostic perception and therapeutic planning to all members of the household in which the child who was referred to the clinic was growing up."¹²

To some, Dr. Pollak's volume came as something of a surprise, since the concept he selected as most useful seemed to them to be indigenous to social work practice. Such authorities as Robert Gomberg had long held that the unique quality of family casework was its understanding of family organization and the different roles normally assumed by several members of the family and use of that understanding.¹³ Nevertheless, it is probable that with certain exceptions social work practice was giving more lip service to "family-centered casework" than was reflected in the casework record.

The relevance of all this to the topic at hand is the rapidity with which this re-introduced concept of family inter-action became part of the new interest in assertive casework and protective casework. Throughout the ups and downs of protective casework in the estimation of the social work community persons, such as Mazie Rappaport, who persisted in the refinement of protective casework techniques, insisted in the need to involve all members of the family in the casework process and to aid them in assuming their respective roles and responsi-

⁸ Fritz Redl and David Wineman—*Children Who Hate*; The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1952.

⁹ Anna Freud—*The Ego and Its Mechanisms for Defense*; International Universities Press, New York, 6th ed., 1954.

¹⁰ *Op. Cit.*, p. 264.

¹¹ Otto Pollak—*Social Science and Psychotherapy for Children*; Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1952.

¹² Herschel Alt—*Social Planning and Protection of the Family*; Jewish Board of Guardians, New York City, Printed, 15 p., 1954; p. 7.

¹³ M. R. Gomberg—"The Specific Nature of Family Case Work," *A Functional Approach to Family Case Work*; Pennsylvania School of Social Work, Philadelphia, Pa., 1944.

bilities.¹⁴ In
sive casewo
stress on fa
of family li
understand
Despite the
is a concept
members o
the concep
latter-day
and protec
authority
ective cas
"Family-C

Authority

Still ano
which the
making t
receptive
work is p
social au
Elliot Stu
casework
workers, i
themselve
sibly beca
authority
error of
many ha
thority p
have att
stituted
authority
derived
mained,

¹⁴ Mazie Rappaport—*Community of Public*; November

¹⁵ Herschel Alt

¹⁶ Elliot Rappaport—*Authority*; June 1954

¹⁷ Cf. C. G. Gordon—*the Auth Family, M Gordon Case Wor* p. 230.

bilities.¹⁴ In the very early reports of aggressive casework Miss Overton placed great stress on family interaction and the Gestalt of family life as something greater than the understanding of each individual member. Despite the fact that family interrelationship is a concept appropriate for all casework with members of families, the avidity with which the concept has been promulgated by the latter-day exponents of aggressive casework and protective casework is such that one authority treats both aggressive and protective casework under the general heading "Family-Centered Casework."¹⁵

Authority Analyzed

Still another illustration of the manner in which the multi-disciplinary approach is making the social work community more receptive to aggressive and protective casework is provided by the recent analysis of social authority factors in casework by Elliot Studt.¹⁶ The question of authority in casework has been much discussed. Caseworkers, in general, have been leery of seeing themselves as possessed of authority, possibly because they equated the possession of authority with the pre-psychoanalytical error of casework. To temper this attitude, many have pointed out the element of authority present in all casework practice and have attempted to distinguish between constituted and inherent authority and the authority of the caseworker and the authority derived from the agency function.¹⁷ It remained, however, for Elliot Studt to bring

together the sociological definition of authority as provided by Harold Laswell and Abraham Kaplan and the psychological definition of authority as provided by Eric Fromm and perceive the continuum of authority in casework with the worker in the voluntary family agency at one end of the spectrum and the probation officer at the other.

Mrs. Studt's formulation plainly brings assertive casework and protective casework into the continuum of social work practice. In these particular casework relationships there is on the part of the client in the beginning neither recognition of formal authority nor psychological authority. The practitioner of aggressive and protective casework techniques brings to the client awareness of the element of formal authority. Once this is accomplished, the major task is to establish the psychological authority necessary to render effective assistance. Sometimes even to accomplish the first goal the protective caseworker needs a delegation of legal authority beyond that which is achieved through employment in the ordinary public or voluntary agency. In commenting on Mrs. Studt's article the editor of the *Journal of Social Casework* plainly saw it as a contribution to the new interest in working with resistant clients and properly said, "It seems to close the debate as to whether casework can be practiced in an authoritative setting."¹⁸

Definition of Protective Casework

The fact that the renewed interest in protective casework is intimately related to the clarification of techniques to reach resistant families in no way demonstrates that protective casework and aggressive casework are equivalent. In defining protective casework service almost all authorities see at least three essential elements:

1. Protective casework service is initiated by a person other than the parent or by an agency.
2. The initiation is essentially the complaint alleging that the parent neglects the child or in some other way jeopardizes the well-being of the child.

¹⁸ "Editorial Notes: Casework and Authority," *Social Casework*, June 1954, p. 258.

¹⁴ Mazie Rappaport—*Protective Service in An Urban Community*; Protective Service Division, Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore, Md., mimeo., 23 p., November 1951.

¹⁵ Herschel Alt, *Op. Cit.*, p. 9.

¹⁶ Elliot Studt—"An Outline for Study of Social Authority Factors in Casework," *Social Casework*, June 1954.

¹⁷ Cf. Crystal Potter and Lucille Austin—"The Use of the Authoritative Approach in Social Case Work," *The Family*, March 1938.

Gordon Hamilton—*Theory and Practice of Social Case Work*; Columbia University Press, New York, 1940; p. 230.

3. The agency cannot withdraw from the picture simply because the parent has refused or is unable to take help.¹⁹

Some authorities²⁰ add a fourth component, namely that the client is not free to withdraw from the relationship, but this is not true of most protective casework as currently constituted. For most protective services as currently constituted the statement that the agency cannot withdraw is essentially a statement of a moral obligation deriving from the function of the agency in the community. This statement is of particular import, however, since it clearly shows that protective casework has to do with parents who not only do not seek help, but whose acts of omission or commission are of such a gross nature that unless the caseworker is successful in establishing a formal authority and then a psychological authority, the alternative is referral to court.

Definition of Aggressive Casework

The practitioner of assertive casework techniques has no more or less legal authority than the practitioner of protective casework service. There is, however, a distinct difference in function. Those who define protective casework inevitably use terms which are essentially not related to technique but related to the function of the worker and the agency. Those who describe aggressive casework essentially talk in terms of techniques. Miss Overton, for example, in explaining her use of the word "aggressive" said it was in the simple positive sense of the dictionary "disposed to vigorous, outgoing activity in behalf of an object."²¹ Miss Regensberg in

suggesting that the word "assertive" might be substituted for "aggressive" said that assertive

"connotes an assurance within the social worker himself that, by virtue of his professional ability he has something to offer, and wholeheartedly wishes to make it known to those who do not yet know about, believe in, or want it."²²

Those discussing assertive casework describe their techniques in terms of home visits, assuming initiative in making first contact, concentrated effort in aiding the referral source to make a referral, giving tangible simple aid as the first step, supporting the client in his contacts with authority, increased activity should the client seek to withdraw prematurely, and similar efforts. It is made clear that most of their clients are reachable and willing to be helped. After an initial effort to establish formal authority, psychological authority is usually quickly established and the helping relationship begins.²³ Moreover, the children in their caseload are usually not victims of the kind of gross neglect which ordinarily precedes court appearance.²⁴ The children are victims of disorganized family life and the social and economic burdens that impinge upon both them and their parents.

Plainly, therefore, assertive casework is a technique which can be practiced in many different settings. Even though it has so far been related to concern for children, it is equally appropriate to instances in which child care is not involved. It requires no special legal authority and these assertive techniques should become part of the techniques of all social workers. The community supports both voluntary and public agencies in the belief that we will be able to help those families who constitute the base of social pathology in most communities. Social work has become aware that casework is not supported exclusively as a medium of help for

¹⁹ Cf. Henrietta L. Gordon, *Op. Cit.*, p. 2. Spencer H. Crookes, "Child Welfare," *Social Work Year Book*; American Association of Social Workers, 12th Edition, New York, 1954, p. 85.

Special Committee of the Community Council of Oklahoma City and County—"A Proposal for A Protective Child Care Unit," mimeo., 14 p., 1954.

²⁰ Henrietta L. Gordon, *Ibid.*

Elizabeth and Karl de Schweinitz, *Op. Cit.*, p. 3. Special Committee of the Community Council of Oklahoma City and County, *Ibid.*

²¹ "Aggressive Casework," *Op. Cit.*, p. 51.

²² *Op. Cit.*, p. 106.

²³ Alice Overton, "Serving Families Who 'Don't Want Help.'" Paper presented at 80th Annual National Conference of Social Work, June 1953; mimeo., 14 p., p. 3.

²⁴ Lionel C. Lane, *Op. Cit.*, p. 61.

the middle
ness we ar
niques to
While ther
for these
time asse
lated in th
require no

Protective A Tech

Protect
many of
casework
this there
function i
focus is o
mine if th

SCHO A C

Regulat
sions
winte
or cli
Advan
sions
cants
exper
previ

Program
to I
visio

THE

the middle-class neurotic. Out of that awareness we are interested in improving our techniques to serve this wider range of clientele. While there is value in having a special label for these efforts at this point in history, in time assertive casework should be assimilated in the kit of social work technique and require no special attention.

Protective Casework, A Technique and Function

Protective casework can and must use many of the techniques labeled as assertive casework techniques, but over and above this there is the special implication of the function in regard to neglectful parents. The focus is on neglect. The worker must determine if there is in fact neglect. The worker

must be aware of the community's inability to tolerate long-term gross neglect and of his own agency's responsibility to carry out the community's mandate. These facts must be shared with the client and the client must be helped to mobilize his strength so as to effect the necessary change in his own interest, his children's interest and the community interest. The protective function may be lodged in family agencies, public child welfare services, or voluntary child welfare services. While the question of just which agency can best exercise the protective function remains unsolved, it is plain that where feasible the special skills demanded make it desirable that the protective casework function be identifiable as such and exercised by workers exclusively devoted to this most difficult task of helping.

SMITH COLLEGE SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL WORK

A Graduate Professional School

*Programs Leading to the Degree
Master of Social Science*

Regular Curriculum (Plan A)—Three summer sessions in study on the Smith campus and two winter sessions in field work in selected agencies or clinics

Advanced Standing (Plan B)—Two summer sessions and one winter session designed for applicants who have had several years of supervised experience in an approved casework agency, or previous graduate work

Academic Year Opens June 20, 1956

Program of Advanced Study (Third Year) Leading to Diploma—To prepare for practice, supervision, and teaching

July 26, 1956 to July 24, 1957

For further information write to

THE DIRECTOR COLLEGE HALL 8
Northampton, Massachusetts

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

The basic Two-Year Graduate Curriculum in social casework or social group work prepares for professional social work practice in all fields. It leads to the degree of Master of Social Work.

The Advanced Curriculum offers to qualified persons who hold a Master's degree in social work an advanced, third year of graduate professional education in social casework, group work, welfare organization, supervision, administration, teaching, or research. This curriculum leads to the Advanced Certificate.

The Doctoral Curriculum for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Social Work includes, and continues beyond, the Advanced Curriculum in any one of its specializations.

Fellowships are available to students in all curricula.

Address all inquiries to:

(MISS) MARGARET E. BISHOP
Director of Admissions and Placement
School of Social Work
University of Pennsylvania
2410 Pine Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

THE PROBLEM OF SEPARATION AND THE FEELING OF IDENTITY*

Edith Buxbaum, Ph.D.

Northwest Clinic of Psychiatry and
Neurology
Seattle, Washington

Separation is one of the repeated experiences in the life of children who are boarded out. In this paper the author discusses the reactions of children to separation and the effects of separation on their feeling of identity.

SEPARATION HAPPENS in everybody's life and people react to it in different ways, depending on their ages, personalities and their life experiences. The feeling of identity too is a universal one. Yet, while it is clear what is meant by separation, it is not easy to define the idea of the feeling of identity. It encompasses feelings of body, emotions, thoughts, actions, one's present and past relations in and to environment. The feeling of identity is with us all our life in every situation. It changes as we change; it can be disturbed, when we are disturbed. When separation is a disturbing experience it necessarily affects the feeling of identity.

In her paper, "Safeguarding the Emotional Health of Children,"¹ Anna Freud discussed as one of the traumatic situations from which children might suffer that of separation of the infant from the mother. She described how the infant would react with physical symptoms such as vomiting, diarrhea, eczema, crying, sleeplessness, etc. She emphasized that the effects of such separations may be only partly corrected by another person taking over the role of the mother entirely and that the setback suffered by the infant at that time continues to exist.

I happened to see a baby of six weeks who was on his way to four-hour feeding periods when he had to be hospitalized for about a week because of an intestinal infection.

Upon his return from the hospital the parents were first delighted, then upset, by his being so quiet, but also, less responsive. After about a week at home the

child was back again to his previous responsiveness, but also to his demand to be fed every two hours; this behavior corresponded to his four to five-week-old behavior—it constitutes a set-back of three or four weeks in an eight-week-old child.

Whether or not he will make up for time lost by developing faster is difficult to ascertain without exact observation.

The baby was exposed to two experiences:

one was his physical illness, the other the separation from home. His reaction was a two-fold one too: a physical one—i.e., his return to an older feeding pattern, and an emotional one—his being less responsive.

We do not know for sure how to coordinate these reactions: Physical illness in an infant is serious and usually brings with it other disturbances. However, a baby who is during this time well taken care of by his mother would ordinarily be even more responsive once the pains and discomforts of the illness are over. It seems to me, therefore, that the lack of responsiveness which this six-week-old baby showed was an emotional reaction to separation rather than to physical illness. The baby's return to an older feeding pattern can be a physiological reaction to his illness; whether it was functional to any extent is difficult to tell. Feelings of discomfort in the intestinal tract, the desire to eat without being hungry is one of the physical reactions to separation which Anna Freud, Spitz, et al. described.

Children, as well as adults, may react in unpleasant or frightening situations with physical symptoms. To have a "knot in one's stomach" is a common description of anxiety or upset. I remember a little girl of five who had in her short life too many placements.

She was afraid when the social worker came that she would have to go to another home since this had happened many times. Every time she saw the social worker

* Delivered at the Child Welfare League Section, National Conference of Social Work, San Francisco, California, June 2, 1955.

¹ Safeguarding the Emotional Health of Children, Casework Papers, 1954, from the National Conference of Social Work.

or anticipated seeing the social worker, she vomited. Her vomiting was an infant's reaction to separation from a mother person, which continued long past the time of her babyhood.

When a physiological reaction like that is established and confirmed through repetition of the original cause, it is likely to stay on throughout the life of a person as a "nervous symptom."

Various Reactions to Separation

Observers² have reported that infants from three to six months and on may react to separation from the mother with severe depression—they may cry a lot and they are inconsolable by anyone but the mother; they don't eat, don't sleep, only cry. After a while they stop crying and become apathetic; they do not smile, do not play with whatever they used to play with. They are sad little creatures. When the mother returns the baby recovers within a matter of hours, or perhaps a day or two. These babies have arrived at a stage where they recognize the mother and are attached to her—and only to her. They are unable to accept a substitute person; the severe disturbance they suffer is comparable to the reaction of mourning in an adult. For these babies the mother is lost when she is gone for even a short while, since they do not know whether she may return. This mourning reaction is accompanied by a loss of whatever achievement the child may have made. If the child has already learned to sit up, he may not try to do this any more. If the child is somewhat older, he may stop talking, if that is what he has just started to do, or he may soil or wet again if that is what he has just learned not to do when mother was around. The most recent achievement, which still takes an effort, which has not become automatic yet, is given up first, but others may follow and the child may regress generally.

The recurrence of wetting and soiling in children who are brought into a new foster home is a well-known fact. Foster parents assume that the child will "get over it" in a

while after he becomes used to them. It is, however, a symptom of the child's sense of loneliness and loss.

One of the most beloved games which little children like to play is hide-and-seek. This play symbolizes the great discovery that things or people may seem to be lost and yet they may return. Mother may leave and yet she may return. In order to conceive this idea the child must be able to remember that the mother who left did return. When this experience is established he can wait for the mother's return and he can expect her to return without falling into utter despair. But what if she doesn't return? The ability of the child to wait is limited as his sense of time is limited. An hour is a long time, a day much too long, a week is an eternity. When he has to wait too long, which is relative to his sense of time, he becomes angry, first at the people around him. He feels generally angry, nothing pleases him, nothing is right and he may express his anger in being naughty and aggressive against the people who take care of him in such a frustrating way. He may or may not say that he wants his mother—but whether he says it or not, this is really what he wants. When mother finally returns, the child usually shows his anger toward her, but also his anxiety that she may leave again. When mother has been away for a week or more the toddler will follow her around like a shadow and cry when she gets out of his sight, while he makes incessant demands upon her and demands her undivided attention. After a while, when he feels secure again, he will relax and trust her to leave and return. The child's ability to express his anger by being naughty, destroying, attacking, biting, running, takes the place of the disastrous depression of earlier months. His increased motility and greater muscular strength make it possible for him to fight rather than to wither away.

When the two-year-old's mother does not return—for whatever reasons this may be, illness, death, desertion—in the child's mind they are all the same—the child's faith in mother, and that means in all mankind, is shattered.

² Spitz, *Anaclitic Depression, Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, Vol. II.

He is angry and terribly frightened. In the child's mind, mother must have left him; even when she dies, he thinks, "She left me." And why would mother leave him? Because she does not love him. Perhaps she loves somebody else more? That's "a bad mother"! Perhaps he was naughty? (Mother may have threatened some time to leave him when he was disobedient.) He soiled his pants, did not eat his breakfast, broke the glass? That's "a bad child"!

These are the only possible reasons in the child's mind for mother's leaving him, either because she is bad or because he is bad. Mostly he thinks both, one after the other. Is mother bad, is child bad? If it were mother who was bad, he is angry at everybody who reminds him of her, and he in turn will be bad too and he will punish her in everybody. If he was bad (and that is why she left), then maybe he'll try to be good, so good he won't dare move. But mostly he'll be alternately very good or very bad according to his fantasies.

New Attempts to Relate

Eventually, if enough time elapses, the new mother-person may become accepted and the child's faith in the world may become restored but with reservations. The foster parents say the child is "testing" them. He is! He tests how much he can trust them, whether they too will desert him. When the child dares to test them it is really a sign that he has some faith in them. Nobody can be trusted without first being tested. He must feel that he can be naughty without being left again. If he is left again after making a new attachment, for whatever reasons this may be, his ability to trust people will be considerably, perhaps irrevocably, impaired. He will be most reluctant to attach himself again. He will attempt to survive in whatever way he can, by fighting or by submitting, but he will not really love anyone. He may long for someone to love him, someone of whom he fantasizes, perhaps the loving mother he first lost long ago, but nobody in real life will ever fill the bill. He has lost the ability to love, as the younger child may have lost the ability to walk, talk, or control his bowels.

In the period of increased muscular control and particularly of cleanliness training, the child is first being introduced to the ideas of good and bad, to prohibition and punishment. He learns to feel guilty and experiences the anger of the adult or his withdrawal of love. He is willing to accept certain limitations, i.e., precepts of civilization in order to secure satisfaction of his needs which are dependent upon this beloved person. Need satisfaction is still completely tied up with his loving a person. When his needs are taken care of by another person, his loyalty goes there. When need satisfaction is endangered, the child by necessity has to fight for his life and increase his narcissism and withdraw from object relations.

When a child has had a normally secure relationship with his parents for the first three or four years of his life, separation and loss of a parent and of his home will still be a most disturbing experience—it is and remains that throughout all our lives—but he has a better chance of weathering it than he has during his earlier years, when he is totally dependent upon his mother for the fulfillment of his needs. When he can move about on his own, talk to people, feed and dress and toilet himself, when he can express his needs and wants, he can more easily accept another person as a substitute for the one he has lost. The big question of why he was left or sent away, will always be in his mind even when he is told the truth and appears to understand it. When parents are divorced or separated and he has to go to live with somebody else because his mother or father has to work, he will wonder whether he has caused their separation. Maybe he secretly or openly had wanted to have mother (or father) for himself and wished the other parent would "never come back," or "go away," or "drop dead." In a way he may have gotten what he wished for, but at too high a price, with too much punishment attached. If a parent has to go to a hospital or dies, the self-reproaches of the child are going to be even worse. He may try to be good or may be completely good in order to undo what he thinks he has done, or he may be naughty in all kinds of ways in order to

get himself punished; he feels then that he gets what he deserves, not, however, for what people think the punishment is for; he wants to be punished for his great sin, the crime of loving one parent so much that he wanted to get rid of the other. Or perhaps he hated his brother or sister, wanting to be rid of them, and this is why he is sent away.

Different Phases Influence Reactions

The reactions of children to the trauma of separation are different depending on their phase of development, and on their individual experiences and conflicts. We sometimes speak of "phase-specific" traumata. Separation seems to be a trauma which is always "phase-specific." In the phase of physiological needs, the child reacts physiologically; when relationship and recognition set in he reacts with loss of relationship and despair. At the height of his dependency, when needs and relationship are met by the mother, depression accompanied by a loss of ego-functions is his reaction. Aggression and guilt feelings will dominate the picture when the balance is upset by the loss of the person whom the child trusts. When he has arrived at the ability to love in a sense which resembles adult love, when he has reached the "Oedipal" phase, his reaction to separation will be in terms of these particular Oedipal conflicts and fantasies. Of course, never is there any phase of development which passes without leaving its traces in the following phase and the one after that. What I have described is schematic and points out the prevalent features at different times.

The development after the Oedipal phase repeats in many ways the development during the first years of life. The child fortifies, weakens, represses or suppresses whatever nucleus of a personality he has acquired so far, with the help and under the pressure of his further life experiences. Separation is one of those experiences which shapes his life, his personality and his feeling of identity.

The Feeling of Identity

The feeling of identity is difficult to define because it changes as the child changes dur-

ing his development. Right after birth we see the child as a bundle of undifferentiated physical feelings; he feels undifferentiated from his mother as long as his needs are immediately met. Perhaps his first dim realization of body feeling is brought on with his first experience of feeling hungry and food not being immediately available. Perhaps these feelings of discomfort can be considered as the beginning of a body feeling. It may be closely connected with his first realization of being separated from the mother. These feelings of discomfort interrupt the state of nirvana, or vegetative existence in which the infant lives. They are being offset by pleasant feelings during the infant's waking time—as, e.g., when he is being fed, when he is being fondled. He begins to enjoy his body, begins to enjoy living. He also learns to recognize the mother, who affords him these pleasures, who talks to him. He knows her voice, he hears her calling him. When he reacts to her voice, maybe there is something more going on than just the expectation of satisfaction; perhaps there is a beginning feeling of self in there. The name becomes the carrier of the self in some ways. When Johnny begins to talk, he will most likely say, "Johnny wants—Johnny likes—Johnny does not want or like." To use the personal pronoun is an achievement of later times—it seems that the infant does not know where his body ends and another person's body starts. He may suck on the nipple or a hand—his own or somebody else's; he may hold his own thumb or somebody else's. He has no awareness of the borders of his body as long as he can suck when he needs to suck or hold when he needs to hold. But gradually he learns that the nipple is not his, that he may have to wait for its return accompanied by mother. He will have many similar experiences until he will finally become aware of himself as differentiated and separate from mother.

Some children are psychologically not sufficiently differentiated from their mothers at a time far beyond that of physiological necessity:

A three-year-old girl did not accept anything from my hand, but put her mother's hand to mine to take what I

offered. She did not talk to me but indicated to her mother what to say. She used her mother as an extension of herself. Of course she could not stay in nursery school by herself; mother had to be there too.

In this inability to stay alone we recognize separation anxiety; it exists as one component of school anxiety until much later. The reason for it in our little three-year-old was that she considered mother as part of herself and felt incomplete without her. When she learned to use her own hands instead of mother's, to use her own speech instead of mother's, she became able to manage for herself. She learned from mother; she did as mother did; she became identified with her and then did not need her as much. In order for this to happen the little girl's mother had to allow her to do so. At this stage of the game the child's dependence on the mother was a result of the mother's dependence on the child. She had fostered this behavior to suit her own needs.

Anna Freud has shown³ that the disturbance of the child is the child's reaction to the mother's own disturbance in a particular area, as in feeding, cleanliness, or genital feelings. Infants gradually discover their bodies and learn how to use them. The infant discovers his fingers and hands and learns to put them into his mouth. Gradually he discovers feet, ears, hair, the genital area. He feels his bladder full, his rectum, hunger, pleasant feelings and unpleasant ones. Awareness of his body in parts and as a whole gives him a body-feeling of himself and as an entity. The mother of our three-year-old must have disturbed this feeling somewhere along the line by not allowing her child to "feel herself" with "her own hands" in all parts of her body. She preferred unconsciously that the child continue to use mother's body instead of her own, thus keeping the child more dependent on her than she needed to be.

Learning to Be Self-Sufficient

However, all children are to some extent physically dependent and feel helpless without their mothers until the time they are

entirely self-sufficient in regard to all their physical needs, when they can feed, walk, dress, toilet themselves. One may say the psychological umbilical cord is cut when the child has learned to do these things himself and feels himself a person. The learning process leading to these achievements is not a simple matter of learning skills, but one of identifications. The child learns not only to do these things, but he learns from the mother or the person who takes care of him how and when to do them. When children are left alone much of the time they become retarded; for example, they frequently do not talk. But when they are left alone during the first year of life, particularly during the first six months, as they may be in orphanages or hospitals, they do not learn how to suck their fingers or how to find their toes, they do not smile, and they do not masturbate. Nobody whom they can recognize touches them so they do not develop feelings toward any one person and they do not develop any feelings of their bodies and for themselves, except pain. But that is not enough to have in order to become a human being. Pain may push the pain barrier down, which may result in the child's hurting himself deliberately, or pushes it up—increasing the narcissistic cathexis—but at any rate it distorts the body image and with it the relations to the world.⁴ The steady contact with one person is necessary in order to make the child feel himself as an entity, as a self.

This feeling can still be very easily upset. When the care-taking person disappears or when the environment changes—moving the bed into another room, moving from one house to another—all of this disturbs the child. This is even more true when a child's first name is changed after he is familiar with it. (This frequently happens when children are adopted.) Having his routine upset is most confusing to a young child. When he is used to using a potty he won't function on the toilet seat; if he is used to going to bed in his parents' bed, he won't stay in his own.

³ Problems of Infantile Neurosis: A Discussion, Vol. IX, Psychoanalytic Study of the Child.

⁴ Hoffer, Willie: *Development of the Body Ego*, *Psa. Study of the Child*, Vol. V.

His feeling of himself is dependent on his knowing where he is and what is expected of him. When environment, routine or name is changed he does not know how to function: a part of his body is beyond his control, a part of his ego-identity is temporarily lost.

Children like to play dress-up. In a way they learn constantly by playing dress-up. They imitate father's way of coming home from work, mother's talking on the telephone, how big brother throws a ball, and also how little sister throws a temper tantrum. Good and bad attitudes, behavior, characteristics and occupations are constantly imitated indiscriminately. This period of indiscriminate imitation is one in which a great deal is being learned, if there is a certain amount of consistency in the environment. If the people whom the child imitates, from whom he learns, are themselves consistent in what they do in the child's presence and what they demand of him, he can learn and imitate them until he has made these traits a part of his personality. How much of it is hereditary or constitutional we do not know; but we do know that environment and experiences are to a large degree responsible in forming a personality.

When a Child is Boarded Out

What happens to a young child when he is boarded out? When he is removed from his environment he does not know where his bed is, or his toys, or the bathroom; not only are routines changed, but everybody around him is changed too. He cannot look to mother to see how she reacts; he does not have brother, who may help him in a fight or perhaps beat him up, to orient himself to. He cannot do as the people he used to be with. His whole system of orientation is thrown over, he is like a skipper without a compass, he is without direction. Only when he attaches himself to one or another person in his new environment will he find a new pivot of orientation, a new object to imitate, and will he regain his functions. This takes time. Before he gets to that point he feels very lonely and scared and often he holds on tensely to

one thing from the past—a doll, stuffed animal, coat, hat, bottle. Whatever it may be, it is the only thing he knows and loves in a strange world. He may become frantic without it. It is a part of his past and therefore part of himself.

The continuity of the past is another point of orientation for the child. He has to remember the house, the people, the pets, the toys, he used to live with. When we forget what we did during a certain time, the place where we were, what the people looked like, what their names were, we are bothered. We feel as if we "weren't all there." The child feels that way too. Not to remember one's past is like losing a part of oneself.

During the period of adjustment to the new place, the child has to learn new attitudes and behavior and to unlearn old ones. The direction in which his personality started to develop is being changed since the people after whom he patterned himself are gone. Not everything and everybody from his past, however, are just forgotten; they still exist in his memory, in his habits, in his thinking; new forms are superimposed upon the old ones—and they don't fit very well. It will take quite a while for him to feel he "belongs," for his new family to feel he is "like their own flesh and blood," until he can let go of that doll, stuffed animal or what not. Children who are moved more than once from place to place *cannot* develop characters of their own. They can only react first to one person and then to another; they will show the characteristics of the person who "has no backbone," who is a "turn-coat." They are the ones who have not learned how to love, they do not trust anybody. They can survive only by a process of adaptation by which they change character with the environment, like chameleons change their colors. They are unhappy children who develop into unhappy adults. They have been deceived and disappointed and they in turn are deceitful and cannot be trusted. Every time they thought they were loved, they tested this love, the people they tested were found wanting, and the child was kicked out. This is the only consistent experience

after which they can pattern their characters. Many of these children become delinquents—later criminals—or psychotic.

Needs Time to Develop

The length of time a child has to develop relationships and to establish behavior patterns is extremely important in order to stabilize his character. Only when he is able to live free from the fear of losing his home again, when he does not have to fight or submit in order to survive, can he stop imitating people just in order to deceive, cajole and please them. He must have time to learn to love them, trust them, must be allowed to become dependent on them, as a young child is dependent on his mother. Then only will he be able to develop in a "normal" way the feelings which a child in a "normal" family would have.

Johnny wants to be like his father whom he admires because he is big and strong. But he also wants to be like him because mother loves father and in order to compete with father for mother's love he wants to be like him. At times he is afraid of his father because of his size and strength and it might be safer to be big and strong oneself in order to cope with him. Being jealous of him at times, he wants him out of the way and fears his retaliation.

Feelings of love, jealousy and competition are standard features of family living, and play a part in what and with whom a child identifies and why; we call this development the Oedipal phase. The identifications which develop out of this situation of conflicts are the ones which become a permanent part of and build a personality. The solution of the Oedipal conflict will determine to a decisive degree with whom the child will make his predominant sex identification, whether he will be homosexual or heterosexual, manifestly or latently. Only when a child has lived through this situation in relative security can he develop a character of his own. The chances that he might come to this development after too many changes before reaching the Oedipal phase are slim. It is difficult for him to hold on to his newly

developed identifications when the family constellation is interrupted during or shortly after the Oedipal phase; he needs time to consolidate his identifications after this phase. It is only then that he has developed a character of his own, which he may preserve even when he has to be separated from the people after whom he has patterned himself.

There are other people besides his parents who are important to him, whom he loves, fears, hates, and after whom he may pattern himself and with whom he may identify. For the young child, older sisters and brothers, adults of any age who are part of the immediate environment, are an influence. When the child is able to go out on his own into supervised or unsupervised groups of children, many more influences enter his life. He may pick up certain characteristics or behavior from them temporarily. When these groups or "gang" influences become permanent, this may occur either because the group is more satisfactory than home or because the attitudes are essentially the same as at home. Group influences remain important throughout our lives and they enlarge the scope of possible identifications.

Identification is a process which continues through our lives, as long as we are flexible. When we come to a new country even as adults, we identify with the new group and the new environment to a certain degree.

Adolescence is a period in which groups are of particular importance. We often hear about adolescents who are in trouble as part of a "gang." Often they are under the influence of one or another person in the gang with whom they identify, or the adolescent may be the leader of the gang, who impersonates some common ideal of the group. Sometimes the groups are socially acceptable, sometimes not, but apparently many adolescents need groups as a part of their lives. If they are living with their families, the group helps them break away from them; if they don't have families, the group offers a substitute. The group in this way helps them be-

come independent once more without their having to be all by themselves.

Of course there are many adolescents who have no use for groups. But then they may form intense friendships or perhaps worship one or the other older person as a shining hero, or have a crush on somebody, or fall in love. But whichever it may be, these intense relationships become the basis for new identifications—some of them temporary, some permanent.

Summarizing "Identity"

In summary, "identity" is a complex idea. It means different things in different stages of development. In the infant it is thought of as body-feeling; with the young child it means his feeling of himself as called by a certain name, his feeling of himself in relation to physical and emotional environment, particularly in relation to his mother. Gradually his feeling of identity encompasses certain behavior patterns and reactions, which may change from temporary, superficial reactions and imitations to permanent characteristics. Finally, all his relations to single people or groups may add to his identifications and to his feeling of identity, which contains his memory of his own past experiences. At any point of this development, a disturbance may occur which will be the more significant the earlier it takes place. It always delays further development, may even make it impossible. Separation from the mother during the first weeks of life can be compensated for by a substitute person. The feeling of identity which the child develops is dependent on the amount and the kind of contact he may have during this time. When sufficient contact is not available the child does not develop any organized body feelings or relationship and appears to be severely disturbed. He may be described as autistic, atypical or prepsychotic and would most likely also be retarded.

When infants have learned to recognize their mother, separation from her can become traumatic. According to different ages

measured in weeks or months, their reactions may vary from apathy to quiet and agitated depressive states. Their extreme dependency upon their mothers is such that they feel lost without her; when she is lost, the child's reason for living is lost. He feels he "is nothing"—his identity is lost with her.

When ideas of good and bad enter into the child's consciousness, being good or bad may then become paramount to his feeling of being. The child says: "I am a good boy," "I am a bad girl," "I am a naughty boy," and it is said with pride, regardless whether it is good or bad. When separation from either or both parents occurs during this phase—usually when mobility and cleanliness are the outstanding achievements and problems—separation emphasizes and fixates this feeling of guilt. Such children will always have to feel guilty about something in order to feel that they exist; continuing to soil, wet and being aimlessly destructive may be their way of holding on to themselves. When they are older, they may want to and try to please whoever takes care of them, thus becoming shifty and fickle, changing character as often as places and hardly knowing themselves who they are. Included in this dilemma is the child's uncertainty of what sex he really is. During the Oedipal phase, when the sexual problem comes to the fore, these identifications put their final stamp on the child's character. Separation from one or the other parent may throw the child's feelings out of balance. Yet his feeling of identity is by this time integrated to such an extent that he does not go to pieces as he would have at an earlier age, provided his previous experiences gave him a certain amount of security. The child, when faced with the trauma of separation after the Oedipal phase, may suffer without being thrown into the kind of chaotic panic of earlier years. This suffering may, however, bring about disturbances of severe neurotic degree. Separation from previous environment, including the parents, is the most drastic interference in a child's life since it necessarily disturbs the child's feeling of identity.

SOCIAL DYNAMICS OF A DAY CARE ASSOCIATION

Margaret C. McCulloch

Member of Boards of Directors
Community Council of Memphis-Shelby
County; Day Care Association

Throughout the country, perhaps the largest number of day care programs, including the majority of children, are under the aegis of commercial or proprietary operators.

Day care services are provided by state and municipal public agencies and by community councils or other community voluntary groups concerned to bring all day care programs to a level which will at the very least prevent the existence of poor and dangerous experiences and which hopefully will develop

services truly helpful to children and their families. Efforts are generally made through: education and supportive means, such as supervision, consultation, demonstration, provision of materials, courses; protective measures, such as licensing and closing of substandard programs.

Lack of proper licensing powers or educational facilities cripples the effectiveness of some public agencies. Voluntary agencies vary widely in the effectiveness of their community-wide educational services and can only occasionally be said to reach anything like all of the local units.

The increasing activity of the licensing and/or educational programs in day care reflects both the communities' concern for what is happening to children and the increased volume of the problems created by the mushrooming of many programs—often poor ones—in which children spend their days. Operators of day care programs are themselves one of the most significant forces for making the necessary improvements in programs caring for children.

Always laborious and frequently exciting is the work in those communities which are really mobilizing themselves to protect children receiving day care. Some communities have achieved a marked degree of improvement so that their children and families are protected and genuinely served. Within the last few years many more communities have taken significant steps toward initiating improvement, resulting in striking developments.

One of the most interesting developments on a community level and one not paralleled elsewhere is to be found in Memphis, Tenn. It is unlikely that the developments there could have taken place locally, even with the ferment found in so much of the South today, if the appropriate department of the state had not already been actively engaged in increasing its responsibility for day care.

The variety of people involved, the intensity of their interest and concern and the tenacity of their efforts—all this is not restricted to Memphis nor to Tennessee. The story may well provide thought for other public departments, other community councils, other operators' associations, and other potential benefactors in the face of the great need to bring protection to the many children throughout the country who daily are hurt by woefully inadequate day care programs.

JUDITH CAUMAN

Day Care Consultant

TYPICAL in some ways, unusual in others, the Day Care Association of Memphis and Shelby County, Tennessee, presents an interesting picture of social dynamics in relation to day care.

Six years ago the situation in Memphis was much like that in other cities of the region. Need for good day care was great; there was a good deal of interest; but there was little organized professional help.

The city of close to 400,000 population, a little over one-third Negro, had highly diversified employment with many women in the working force. Working mothers had to make some provision for small children. This ranged from leaving them locked into frame

shacks, through care by relatives or baby sitters, to placement in whatever kind of "kindergarten," "nursery school" or "nursery" might be found. These, unlicensed and unsupervised, were scattered haphazardly about the city.

Over the years, the matter had come repeatedly before the Board of the local Community Council. The need of action had been recognized, but the Board believed that a comprehensive study of all aspects of child care in the city must come first. And for this there were no funds.

Such was the situation when action began in 1949.

The Unu

The st
ways. Fin
munity d
tive of of
private.
among th
lation, r
more cus

In 19-
vived an
mittee o
was com
citizens
Board o
called t
member
the day
minister
health r

The C
the Bo
with th
director
proach.
Throug
and the
and Le
the cit
made i
sociolog
Council
day car
Council
search

The
week f
He loc
ters, l
study.
impos
instan
and ke
worki
eries"
age. F
equip
quate
the "
state"

CHIL

The Unusual Start

The start of action was unusual in two ways. First, it arose from spontaneous community demand rather than from the initiative of official child welfare bodies, public or private. Second, it arose from leadership among the minority group, the Negro population, rather than from the majority as is more customary in this region.

In 1948-49, the Community Council revived and reorganized an inter-racial Committee on Negro Welfare that had lapsed. It was composed of both social workers and lay citizens and made directly advisory to the Board of Directors. One of the first problems called to the Committee's attention by its members was the need of remedial action on the day care problem. The call came from a minister, a high school principal, a public health nurse, and several social workers.

The Committee took the matter up with the Board. After considerable discussion, with the help of a sympathetic executive director, the Committee found a fresh approach which the Board felt able to approve. Through negotiations between the Committee and the Council Executive on the one hand and LeMoyne College, a Negro college in the city, on the other, arrangements were made in the summer of 1950 for a LeMoyne sociology major to do his internship with the Council, making a listing and study of Negro day care centers under the supervision of the Council's Director of Research and the Research Advisory Committee.

The student worker worked ten hours per week from September 1950 to January 1951. He located and studied 25 of the larger centers, locating another four or five too late for study. He found the centers very diverse and impossible to classify, "kindergartens," for instance, sometimes running double sessions and keeping some children until called for by working mothers as late as 6 p.m.—or "nurseries" including also a group of kindergarten age. He found them all handicapped in plant, equipment, and salary scale, by lack of adequate income. On the other hand, he found the "directors" or "operatives" above the state's recommended minimum of a high

school education; all had that and a good many had from one to four years of college. He also found among the operatives a genuine interest in children and a keen desire to find ways to improve the care given them. Apparently, it made little difference in this feeling whether the center was sponsored by a church, a board of trustees, a P.T.A. or merely an individual.

Meantime, at the Council, a constant process of informal consultations was going on among staff members and between members of the Research Advisory Committee, Negro Welfare Committee and the Board. The student's findings were received with keen interest and were sent to the Board with the recommendation that a workshop be held by the Council to assist the heads of centers with the problems revealed by the study on which many of them had expressed the desire for help. The Board approved and the matter passed from the stage of initial study to that of action.

Unusual Response to Workshop

The workshop plans were assigned to the Council's Division of Family and Child Welfare, and a workshop was scheduled for late February and early March.

Timing and planning were both favorable. Two parallel, independent developments undoubtedly contributed to general public concern about local day care. One was the very active Memphis and Shelby County participation in the work of the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children. The other was the tragic burning to death of small children in several separate instances through their being locked in at home while parents were away at work, and the vigorous newspaper publicity given the problem.

The workshop was set for two night sessions per week for two weeks, convenient for center workers busy by day. And it was decided to invite all centers known, whether included in the study or not, and without regard to type, race, or sponsorship. The result was a cordial response and a registration of some 50 persons.

The value of the preliminary study and the good methods used in it showed in the re-

sponses. There was more enthusiasm and a higher rate of acceptance among the operatives interviewed by the student than among those now approached for the first time.

The theme of the workshop "Doing the Best We Can with What We Have," was an excellent choice psychologically. It encouraged the more timid operatives to come freely with the others without fear of being held to impracticable standards or criticized for shortcomings.

It was interesting, and perhaps one of the unusual features in this development, that responses from "commercial" operatives, those running private centers of their own, were as widespread and as enthusiastic as those from any other group.

The workshop program was built upon the actual needs found in the study of the centers with emphasis on those stressed by center directors themselves: organizing a day care center, qualifications and responsibilities of workers, necessary equipment, planning the children's day. At each session, there was a different chairman with a special skill related to the evening's topic. From two to four additional persons with special knowledge gave short talks. Those persons were drawn from such organizations as the Department of Public Welfare, Children's Bureau, Public Health Nurses, Dairy Council. The second hour was divided between a half hour discussion and a half hour summarizing.

Attendance and enthusiasm were high throughout, and at the closing session the members decided they would like to form a continuing association. The purpose was to pool experiences and problems and to work toward better training for the directors and better standards for the centers. They voted to elect five persons, and to ask the Council to appoint five, the ten to form a joint committee to launch and direct the further organization. With Council approval, this was done and the workshop passed over into an Association in March 1951.

The Joint Committee Phase

For three years the Association functioned under this joint Association-Council Com-

mittee. It adopted a constitution, elected officers, and transacted business; but the general planning and programing was done by the Joint Committee.

For convenience the Association's activities in this phase may be divided into two parts: the regular monthly programs and special projects.

The monthly meetings were primarily educational. Topics were chosen chiefly from suggestions of Association members, the majority of whom were center directors. Among the topics were these: Home-Made Equipment; Health and Hygiene; Physical Growth and Nutrition; Art, Music, and Books; Parent Study Groups; What to Expect of a Five-Year-Old; Licensing and Standards; Fire Hazards; Budgets and Finances. Initiative continued to come from the members; other agencies provided specialists for the programs on request. Among the very cooperative agencies were the Department of Public Welfare at both the state and local levels, Family Service of Memphis, local Fire Department, Department of Public Health, Red Cross, and Dairy Council.

Membership was open to anyone interested in day care; but, with some drop-outs and some additions, the original workshop membership remained as the core of membership throughout this phase, with continuing high interest and participation.

In 1952, besides the regular monthly meetings, thirteen Association members attended courses sponsored by the Mental Hygiene Society of Memphis and Shelby County and taught by faculty members of the local colleges and the University. The courses dealt with the mental and emotional development of young children.

In 1953, approximately 25 members took the Red Cross course in First Aid and Life Saving.

One of the first special projects was the purchase and circulation of professional materials on child care in packets assembled by the Child Welfare League of America. The packets were widely used and found very helpful. A need was then felt for more extensive materials, including books, especially

among heads of Negro centers who had not access to all community resources. This need happened to synchronize with felt needs of two other groups for books, one group studying family life and one religious education. This triple impetus called into being a special committee, independent of all three groups, but containing members of each. A one-year project of this committee cooperating with the public library and aided by the United Church Women of Memphis and Shelby County resulted in the addition of some \$400 worth of books in these three fields to the Negro branch of the public library.

A second successful project was the toy-exchange. Need for some central depot of toys and equipment to be borrowed by centers was soon felt. The items might serve both to help new centers just getting started and to introduce new and good types of equipment to directors. After search for a sponsor, one was found. The Negro Shriners of Memphis voted to adopt the project, the men raising the money and providing the place, the women of the Associated Auxiliary giving volunteer service to check items out and to help transport them. Late in 1953, the Shriners brought the noted Karamu Quartet of Cleveland to Memphis and cleared enough money to launch the project. Details of orders for toys and of scheduling and handling were being worked on when the Joint-Committee phase closed.

A third project was the effort to develop in the local Association standards that would be at once sound and practicable in the local situation. While no formal set of standards was drawn up, members learned a great deal in the process; mimeographed sheets of suggestions were drawn up and distributed; members in charge of centers made many individual improvements in their own centers and they became enthusiasts for state standards and licensing.

A fourth project, that of getting a local college to provide a relevant curriculum and a demonstration nursery or kindergarten, has not yet been achieved but is still on the agenda.

The fifth project was to secure a trained consultant. Two approaches were made. First was to find funds and a qualified person for the Association to employ as its own consultant. As this was found not to be possible immediately, the Association hoped that such a consultant might be appointed by the State Department of Public Welfare to serve the Department on a state-wide basis in connection with the licensing of day care centers. The Association expressed to the Department its interest in the licensing program. By an act of the Legislature in 1953, responsibility for licensing the centers was placed in the State Department of Welfare. The appointment of a consultant on the state staff was one of the Department's first steps in implementing the day care licensing. This consultant has worked helpfully with the Association ever since her appointment.

Even more exciting was the dream come true of the Association having its own executive. Through the Community Council an anonymous donor was found who gave a year's part-time salary. From among the original workshop leaders the Association called on one who had been an enthusiastic volunteer worker ever since—a young woman with a college degree, some graduate work in education of the pre-school child, and some teaching experience in nursery school, kindergarten and first grade. She accepted the call and was appointed to work for a year as executive secretary and consultant. With money in hand and worker chosen, the Association revised its constitution, obtained a state charter, converted its executive committee plus some new members into a Board of Directors, terminated the "Joint Committee," and became an autonomous association in April 1954.

On Its Own

The autonomous association is only a year old. It is too soon to evaluate its activities; they can only be briefly sketched.

Goals were adopted and every Board member assigned to a committee working on one or another of the goals which follow:

1. to create an awareness in the community of the benefits children should derive from day care, (ways, media, etc., should subcommittee of Board and Association be appointed to work on this project?);
2. to consider ways of helping some of the small private centers plan toward more adequate financing in order to raise standards of care;
3. to consider ways of helping center directors to promote education of their parents' groups in how a child grows through play, what to expect of different age levels, nutritional needs, etc.;
4. to consider possibilities of getting a sponsor for setting up a model day care center with professionally trained staff on a demonstration basis as a resource for observation and consultation;
5. to consider possibility of securing courses in child development and family relations through our local colleges;
6. to support the education and program committees in developing a two-week model day care center as a summer workshop for day care center personnel.

The Association's new executive started on triple duties. She replaced the Council's staff member as executive secretary. By invitation of the State Department of Public Welfare, she has served on the State Advisory Committee on Standards of Day Care. By invitation of members, she visits centers as consultant. The Association still meets in Council offices and consults Council staff frequently but now carries full responsibility for all its own activities.

In May 1954, the Toy and Equipment Exchange opened and it has been in service ever since.

In June and July, three members attended the Vassar Summer Institute on scholarships, studying child care and related subjects. One part scholarship came directly from Vassar through a Vassar graduate in the Association; two full scholarships were given by the Association's "Fairy Godparent," the anonymous donor of the consultant's salary. The three members who went were Negroes, teaching in local centers, one a nursery director and two kindergarten teachers.

On their return they gave reports, both enthusiastic and detailed, to the Association, demonstrated toys made at the Institute, and then the two kindergarteners put on a two-week demonstration kindergarten with 20 children. Totalling the daily attendance of observers, both white and Negro, there was a gross attendance of 70; this includes a number of repeaters interested enough to return several times, some from quite long distances.

The kindergarteners demonstrated both equipment and methods learned at the Vassar Institute.

In the Fall, the year's programs were outlined and the Board Committees activated.

Goal 6, the summer demonstration kindergarten, was already achieved. Goals 5 and 4 must await community developments. Goals 1, 2 and 3 were actively taken up. Good press, radio, and even TV publicity has been secured, Kodachrome slides have been made; speakers are being presented to interested groups. The financial support of centers is being studied. A brief initial study showed four major types in terms of sponsorship: 1. church, 2. non-profit board, 3. P.T.A.—public school, 4. owner-operated. All charge fees in varying amounts. Only the P.T.A. kindergarten and one type of owner-operated, that serving middle and upper income groups, are able to operate on fees alone. A mimeographed tabulation of the types and of the methods to supplement fees was distributed to the members and conferences with individual center directors will follow. Taking one sponsorship type at a time, the financially strongest will first be conferred with in each type to get ideas that may be helpful to those with greater financial difficulties.

A December public program presenting Dr. James L. Hymes, of George Peabody College, in Nashville, drew an audience of about 100, who participated actively in discussion after the lecture. It is hoped to have one such event yearly.

Meantime, the State's Committee on Standards has completed its work; the State Department of Public Welfare has adopted the standards; and all that is now needed for the long-desired licensing program to begin are the approval and release of the standards by the State's Attorney General.

This, we trust, is the beginning, not the end of a story. The Association's Fairy Godparent has renewed the salary grant for the coming year. Many problems lie ahead; resources, though enlarged, are still small, but the Association members continue their positive and constructive approach to the future in the spirit of the initial workshop, "Doing the Best We Can with What We Have."

EDITORIAL COMMENT

"Children Deprived of Adoption"

NO SUBJECT is more perplexing to all of us than adoption. Miss Pearl Buck, in her article "Children Waiting," which appeared in the September issue of the *Woman's Home Companion*, has raised many issues, some of which were answered by Mr. Reid in the October edition of *CHILD WELFARE*. Mr. Reid, along with many of us, deplored the negative aspects of Miss Buck's presentation as well as the disregard for available facts and the resultant confusion.

Our readers will be interested to know that, under the auspices of the Welfare and Health Council of New York City, a committee has been engaged in a reappraisal of the New York City adoption situation, as a follow-up of a 1948 study on adoptions and services to unmarried mothers.

We were immediately struck with the obvious need to expand all adoption services, and have been urging agencies, who are already doing adoptions, to expand their services to the limit. At the same time we have been urging both public and private agencies to add this service to their other foster care services.

Before the Committee got very far along in its deliberations, we became convinced that there was a general and specific lack of knowledge of resources. The Committee, therefore, compiled and circulated widely an inclusive directory of shelters and other services for unmarried mothers, with suggestions on how to make referrals.

The Adoption Committee has also studied and scrutinized the present populations of a group of foster care agencies represented in the membership of our Welfare Council to see how many children are or might become adoptable, and why or where we have failed, or are presently failing these children.

This study, entitled "Children Deprived of Adoption," has been most revealing. Some of our Committee were reluctant to release the findings, feeling that, perhaps, there had been insufficient opportunity for interpreta-

tion and for documentation. They wished to avoid any misinterpretation or negative use of the figures. However, after weighing the pro's and con's, we decided that it was most important that the public should know that had there been more services available to children and their parents, many of the children who are in boarding care today on a long-term basis might have been adopted. At the same time it must also be understood that in the past adoption had been considered possible only for children with no physical or other difficulty. Children with some physical handicap, the older child, the child of interracial background was not wanted until agencies began to interpret their need and the source of satisfaction they could be.

Social workers all over the country are conscious of the growth over the years in their professional knowledge, as well as knowledge in related fields, which adds to our understanding of the needs of children, their families, and prospective adoptive parents. All need help and protection. The more we know, the more reluctant we are to exclude any child from the advantages of adoption; training also gives us an awareness of its pitfalls.

We have learned, and the evidence is starkly before us, that services must be available at the time when children need them most, because children do not wait to grow up. Putting off until tomorrow, what ought to be done today, is horrifyingly costly in terms of happy lives for the children in our care, and, also, for the families that might provide them with love and security.

Obviously, in many instances we need better and clearer legislation, but we must always be mindful of the fact that laws in most instances have been conceived in order to protect children. The laws need to be interpreted before their shortcomings can be corrected. Perhaps we have been too prone to attack the existing structure, when, through working constructively within the present legal framework we could also reveal the aspects which frustrate our best efforts to recognize the rights of children as well as those of their parents.

It is with this three-pronged approach to the adoption situation, that we in New York are looking ahead to using our knowledge and skills to do better for our children. We realize too that though great and satisfactory improvements in service are and will continue to be made, no matter how hard we try, in a few years we will probably come to the conclusion that we could have done a still better job. It is the recognition that no efforts to improve services ever bring a "final and perfect way" which characterizes our American way of making progress.

Children's agencies cannot afford to let unfounded criticisms such as those made by Miss Buck discourage them. On the contrary, they should spur us on to greater efforts. We are all concerned about the need for additional services. However, recommendations for expansion of adoption services and services to unmarried mothers, call for additional personnel to study and work on family and legal problems, and this costs money. It is our responsibility, as citizens concerned with child welfare, to demonstrate and interpret how effective our services can be, and to work strenuously with our total communities all over the country for adequate support of what we know is in the best interests of the children of today and tomorrow.

MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD

Board Member, Child Welfare League of America

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Citizen Activity Pays Off— A Happy Sequel

In October 1954, just about a year ago, Miss Katharine Lenroot reported in *CHILD WELFARE* on her experience as a member of a Citizens' Committee of Westchester County, N. Y., which was preparing a statement on recommended qualifications and duties of a children's court judge. This activity was initiated in preparation for the replacement of Westchester's beloved and able Judge Smyth who was to be retired the end of 1955. The Committee was aware that political pressure would be put upon the two major parties to offer this post as a reward for faithfulness to the party.

The Committee finally drew up a list of 11 persons who met the qualifications in the hope that if none of these would be the parties' choice, they would at least serve as examples of the kind of persons who should be considered. Reporting on the coming election when the choice is to be made, the *NPPA News*, a publication of the National Probation and Parole Association, states:

The preparation of qualifications by representatives of civic organizations, their approval by organizations throughout the county, the organizing of a second and independent Citizens' Committee to make use of the standards and give the necessary consideration to the names submitted—all of this took a year and a half of continuous citizen activity. Possibly the time allowed for building up public knowledge and interest accounts for the fact that when the party leaders finally met to make their selection, both chose their nominee from the approved list.

Perhaps Westchester's experience indicates a type of citizen participation in the selection of judgeship nominees which might prove acceptable in other sections of the country. If they are to be constructive, suggestions from citizen groups must be based on knowledge of the requirements of the position and must be made well in advance of the date set for party nominations.

Complaining about a candidate already nominated gives little satisfaction and is bad for the disposition. On the other hand, choosing between two well-qualified candidates for a children's court judgeship may create a dilemma for the voter, but still a happy one.

University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work



PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION for men and women

*Leading to the Master of Social Work and
to the Doctor of Social Work Degrees*

**A new Work-Study Program (Plan A)
is announced to parallel the regular
2-year program, (Plan B) for the
Master of Social Work**

**The Doctorate program emphasizes
teaching, research and administration**

READER'S FORUM

Evaluating Adoptive Applicants

This Reader's Forum refers to the lead article in the February issue of *CHILD WELFARE*. When Mr. Loeb wrote commenting on Dr. Aronson's paper on "Evaluating Adoptive Applicants," we decided that his thoughtful comments would be of interest to our readers, particularly if Dr. Aronson himself would respond. With Mr. Loeb's permission, therefore, we forwarded his letter to Dr. Aronson who, in the interest of further clarification, very graciously consented to write a reply for publication. The two letters follow.

Dear Editor:

The eloquent plea by Professor Hutchinson that we share "our precious thoughts" along with Dr. Aronson's stimulating article, "Evaluating Adoptive Applicants" in the February issue of *CHILD WELFARE* has encouraged me to write out a few comments. For some time, I have been interested in the problem of predictive evaluation of adoptive applicants. Dr. Aronson's approach shows the direction that we might go to make our evaluations more meaningful. However, in spite of his clarity, many questions come to mind. Tabulation of case record material into "selected data" and "tentative conclusions" suggests two other columns: "alternative possible reactions" and "possible interpretations of these alternatives." Although it may be unfair to use excerpts from a longer paper, when one applies these two new columns to the case material presented, one can conclude that each member of the couple involved in the case has worked out some quite adequate solutions to problems derived from a traumatic childhood and that there are many signs of emotional growth.

It is not too outrageous to suggest that some of Dr. Aronson's judgments may be made on the basis of straightforward upper-middle class values. For example, he deprecates brewery vat cleaning (which I understand is a fairly skilled occupation), night work (which after all pays more and is not so disruptive if one does not have children), Red Cross Grey Ladies, Civil Defense airplane spotters, and what to many people is an interesting hobby, growing miniature trees. There is even the interesting implication that sexual activity should be carried on only in the dark of night. It is not the object of this communication to make a detailed critique but other examples of implicit norms can be pointed out. When the prospective adoptive father says of his marriage, "There ain't no yelling. We work as a team." the tentative conclusion includes the extreme statement "peace at all cost" which seems to me to be a long way from a dislike of yelling.

In several spots in the analysis, Dr. Aronson discounts "acceptance" and here again, we may ask: What else would be appropriate and realistic? In another vein I would like to know on what basis it can so flatly be stated, "An adopted child is not concerned with the cause of sterility of adoptive parents."

My questioning does not mean to imply that I do not appreciate Dr. Aronson's direct approach to the evaluation of prospective adoptive parents, nor that I think, from the data presented, that this couple would make good adoptive parents. I do think, however, that norms overtly or unconsciously used need to be brought out into the open and discussed if we are to improve adoption practice.

Sincerely,

MARTIN B. LOEB
Community Studies, Inc.
Kansas City, Mo.

Reply

The difficulty Mr. Loeb experiences in "accepting" the method of understanding people suggested by me, is due to his apparent assumption that the approach is direct. This is exactly what it is not. The purpose of the suggested method is to add a knowledge of the unconscious forces, or at least an inkling of motivational knowledge, to our awareness of known, directly observable and openly stated motivations for adoption. The approach cannot be direct. Conclusions must be drawn from certain data that the parent needs to hide rather than disclose; seemingly insignificant clues must be selected and carefully examined for their hidden meanings. One must read between the lines and draw inferences from what the parent fails to tell you as well as from data which he willingly brings into the open.

Obviously, such a method is not easily taught, neither do the conclusions reached have the precise value of a mathematical formula. The term "tentative" was used to indicate a degree of uncertainty, but also to suggest that one has some idea of thought processes that go on in the deeper layers of the mind, that are unknown to the parent and at best vaguely known to the examiner.

Norms of behavior, of course, are an integral part of the armamentarium of the outside observer. Where can we obtain these norms? The only possible source is a comparison with the behavior of other people. If most people work days and sleep nights and someone reverses this arrangement, we must first carefully consider reality reasons

for this. If he cannot obtain a day job, or if the night job offers unusual opportunities for earning or promotion, if his work is of such a nature that it cannot be performed during the day or if any other reality factor explains to our satisfaction his choice of a night job, then of course one would not be justified in utilizing this fact as an indication of unconscious needs. However, if reality explanations fail us, then the conclusion seems warranted that the man sleeps days and works nights for reasons "from within," for reasons which he cannot plausibly and convincingly explain, because he himself is unaware of them. A conclusion that he thereby wishes to avoid social and family obligations, again cannot be drawn from this fact alone, but is suggested by it. However, one can become reasonably certain when additional facts from the man's history and behavior point in the same direction.

Similar considerations apply to other criticisms raised. It goes without saying that harmony in marriage is desirable, but the extreme emphasis on "absence of yelling" is one of several indications in Mr. B.'s life that verbal strife between members of a family is highly disturbing. (Others are the onset of stuttering related by Mr. B. to mother's yelling and continued cautious avoidance of arguments with mother.)

Work satisfaction is a relative matter. It cannot be judged by any absolute standards but has to be evaluated in reference to individual experiences. A bricklayer may be proud of his work and an outwardly successful engineer dissatisfied with the products of his labor. One may infer that Mr. B., who is ambitious as well as insecure in other facets of living, hides behind a self-deceptive facade of pride in order to avoid a sense of frustration at failure of more ambitious, possibly non-menial accomplishments. Thus, it is he who is deprecating.

In observing adopted children it appears that their concern is primarily with the question of why their own mother did not keep them and if and why the adoptive parents really want them. In my own experience a child has never been curious about the adoptive parents' sterility.

Varied interests of a parent, such as Civil Defense, working as a Grey Lady or growing miniature trees, is certainly not indicative of personality disturbance. These often are valuable assets to one's personality. However, where these activities are pursued compulsively or take the place of other more commonly employed pastimes or occupations, one may wonder if they might not serve

some type of escape. Mrs. B.'s basic fearfulness and anxiety, and her emotional instability might justify some such suspicion.

I too would wish to establish norms of behavior which could be applied in our study of adoptive parents with slide rule accuracy. Unfortunately, this is not possible. The willingness to refine judgment and apply it liberally assures the attainment of a fair degree of understanding of adoptive parents.

HOWARD G. ARONSON, M.D.

Research Associate, Institute for Psychoanalysis,
Chicago, Ill.

Editor's Note: Further comments are invited.

BOOK NOTES

Roofs For The Family, by Eva Burmeister, Columbia University Press, New York, 1954. 203 pp. \$3.25.

Those who have read Miss Burmeister's *Forty-five in the Family* (Columbia, 1949) will want to read *Roofs For The Family*. Those who have not had the pleasure of reading that earlier book are urged to read both as soon as possible. Both belong in the small essential literature devoted to the institutional care of children and, like such older classics as *Wayward Youth* and *The Road To Life*, they can be recommended not only to professionals, but to anyone interested in children.

Roofs For The Family is the true story of the thinking and the activity that went into the decision to give up the Old Home of the Lakeside Children's Center, in Milwaukee, a congregate building erected in 1887, and to replace it with a more modern institution. The book is, in good part, the story of how professional understanding and acceptance of the special needs of children in placement were made the basis for the actual planning of the new cottages, for the involvement of the children once construction began, and were used to make the final move from the old and familiar to unknown new setting helpful rather than threatening. One can only admire the simplicity, accuracy, and thoroughness with which Miss Burmeister explores the ways in which decisions were made and then translated into acceptable reality or children, staff and Board.

There is some danger, however, that Miss Burmeister has been so disarmingly simple and direct and yet so professionally thorough in her thinking and presentation that she will convince where she ought rather to stimulate and provoke. No one can disagree, for example, with her feeling that she "wanted the cottages to be as homey as possible" and it is easy to accept the fact that she "had learned, from living in the Old Home, that the children liked to be in and out of the kitchen, to smell the smells of cooking. . . ." One can, however, agree with all of this and yet disagree completely with the conclusion that this "definitely ruled out . . . a central kitchen and dining room for the whole institution." Actually, any such decision needs to be based on a much larger number and variety of considerations, as Miss Burmeister would undoubtedly agree. The argument that group dining is not "homey" carries some weight, of course, but it cannot be compelling, since, as Miss Burmeister notes in another connection, a children's institution "needs to be honestly what it is—a children's institution," with its own problems and mode of life.

A more serious question may be raised regarding the central argument of the book, that the cottage plan institution is today the proper setting in which to meet the needs of those children who require placement but cannot use foster home care.

It is at least possible that child care already has outgrown the cottage plan, as it outgrew the congregate institution a generation ago. Small buildings, like those in any middle class neighborhood, housing perhaps ten, or apartments in an urban setting, housing the same number or even fewer children, may well be the pattern appropriate in most cases to our present needs, concepts, and methods, as the cottage plan was thirty or forty years ago.

Such questions need to be kept in mind, not because Miss Burmeister intends to be dogmatic, but because she is so very persuasive. Her charm and modesty also create the danger that readers may underestimate the authority with which she speaks, as well

as the attention and effort which the book merits. The fact is that *Roofs For The Family* is, fortunately and of necessity, a very personal description of a very personal creation, as well as an invaluable contribution to the literature on child placement.

BERNHARD SCHER

Director, Group Residence Division
Jewish Child Care Association of New York

●
The Juvenile in Delinquent Society, Milton L. Barron. Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y., 1954. 347 pp., \$5.00.

The Juvenile in Delinquent Society is a thought-provoking book. The author uses a wide inter-disciplinary approach and leans heavily on the sciences of psychiatry, sociology, psychology, and anthropology.

The child is seen in a primary and secondary group—the family on the one hand and society on the other. The latter point is too often neglected by writers who believe that the problem of juvenile delinquency can be explained entirely on the basis of child-family relationships.

Mr. Barron points out the importance of sound statistical procedures, which are particularly valuable if we are to measure the effect of our present programs in relation to rise and fall of alleged delinquency.

Actual case histories are used in one part of the book to illustrate definition, profile, and dynamics of delinquency; while in another part multiple causations are given.

In Part II the author again makes a broad approach as to the causative factors of delinquency, also showing the importance of the role of the family. He asks some 40 stimulating questions, the purpose being to help us analyze our own thinking as to the consistency of our approach to delinquency.

Mr. Barron indicates that our society is a very inconsistent one and many things we condone for adults we consider unlawful for children. Some of the points that he makes are the status and power involving a pressure culture which he feels certainly has a great deal of effect on the thinking of young people. Other points he mentions are resistance to authority, toughness, dupery, all of which are accepted by a great many people.

The third part of the book, regarding societal reactions to delinquency, is handled in a very realistic and factual manner and in this part the author definitely shows his acceptance of all disciplines that give a better understanding of the treatment of the problem as a whole. He describes sound practices as used by some juvenile courts, law enforcement officials, and others, but also he points up the bad practices and limitations as used in many sections of our country.

The main criticism that might be validly raised is directed to the author's inadequate and not complete picture of present attempts to cope with, to reduce and prevent juvenile delinquency. His disregard for what is actually happening in many of our courts and communities in terms of treatment programs now in action is not fair and may be misunderstood. We in the work know that there are many good programs which fail from lack of public interest and support.

To change the direction of behavior from the juvenile to society, in this reviewer's

opinion, tends only to overemphasize delinquency and is not helpful in trying to understand our problem.

Professor Barron's call for a new approach by "some modification of the social structure and culture of American society itself" may be acceptable as an ideal but does not help those who are faced daily with the huge problem in our every community.

However, as a whole, *The Juvenile in Delinquent Society* is a most useful and helpful book, and I suggest that it be read by all juvenile court judges, probation officers, counsellors, students, in fact, by everyone interested in the welfare of our youth.

DONALD E. LONG

Presiding Judge, Court of Domestic Relations,
Portland, Oregon

President, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges

New League Member

Jewish Family & Children's Service of Denver
314 14th St.
Denver 2, Colorado
Dr. Alfred M. Neumann, Executive Director

CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL OPENINGS

Classified personnel advertisements are inserted at the rate of 10 cents per word; boxed ads at \$6.50 per inch; minimum insertion, \$2.50. Deadline for acceptance or cancellation is eighth of month prior to month of publication. Ads listing box numbers or otherwise not identifying the agency are accepted only when accompanied by statement that person presently holding the job knows that the ad is being placed.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA—Casework vacancies for experienced graduate workers in family agency. Salary \$3600-\$5500. Appointment salary dependent on qualifications. Write Mrs. Ella H. Perkins, Executive Director, Family Service of Phoenix, 702 E. Adams St., Phoenix, Ariz.

CASEWORKER, opening for professionally trained caseworker in family and children's agency. Staff of 10. Qualified supervision and psychiatric consultation. Salary to \$4980. Catholic Social Service, Thayer Bldg., 577 14th St., Oakland 12, Calif.

SAN DIEGO County needs two child welfare workers—one in adoptions and other in general child welfare. Beginning salary \$360. The Child Welfare Division of the Department of Public Welfare has broad program of special services to children under professionally trained supervisors. Promotional possibilities good. The examination may be given in your locality. Contact County Civil Service, Room 402 Civic Center, San Diego, California for details.

CASEWORKER, Catholic, professionally trained for progressive family & child welfare agency. 20 miles south of San Francisco. Salary \$3780-\$4704, can appoint at \$4704. Social Security & retirement benefits. 1 month vacation. Good supervision and psychiatric consultation. Apply Catholic Social Service, 112 N. San Mateo Dr., San Mateo, Calif.

CASEWORKER in small private children's agency offering residential and foster home programs; services to unmarried parents; adoptions. Good supervision; psychiatric consultation; opportunity for professional growth. Requirements: Master's degree social work school; experience in adoption desirable. Woman. Salary \$3380-\$4560. Miss Gertrude Breese, Woodfield Children's Village, 1899 Stratfield Rd., Bridgeport 29, Conn.

CASEWORKER. Opening in family-children's service agency for qualified caseworker. Salary range comparable with good agency practice. Information upon inquiry. For further information write Director, Catholic Social Service Bureau, 478 Orange St., New Haven 2, Conn.

CASEWORKER—Residential Treatment Center for emotionally disturbed children, Hartford. Private, nonsectarian, statewide, multiple-function agency. Small case loads, excellent supervision, student training program, psychiatric consultation. Master's degree social work and preferably some experience required. Present salary \$3200-\$4700 depending on experience. Beginning January 1956 all salaries adjusted to new scale \$3800-\$5300. Please write Miss Ruth H. Atchley, Assistant Executive Director, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

CHILD WELFARE WORKER in local public welfare department to carry casework services and placement in subsidized foster homes of children referred to department and to work with unmarried mothers. Requirements: Master's degree social work school, or one year in school of social work plus one year social work experience. Salary \$3588-\$4212. Complete details by writing to Director of Personnel, Municipal Bldg., Hartford, Conn.